1	WO	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA	
8		
9	Edward J Gladney,	No. CV-17-00427-TUC-DCB
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER
11	V.	
12	JT Shartle, et al.,	
13	Defendants.	
14		
15	The Court rules on the remaining discovery related issues. Discovery is closed,	
16	(Order (Doc. 62), except where necessary to complete any discovery ordered herein.	
17	Plaintiff's Second Motion to Compel	
18	Denied, as to requests for admissions related to Plaintiff having female physical	
19	characteristics, for the reasons stated by the Defendant in the Response. Interrogatory 24	
20	and Request for Admission 10 are not relevant to Plaintiff's negligence claim. Defendant	
21	shall answer the Requests for Admissions 11, 12, 13. It is relevant to the negligence claim	
22	whether Defendant should have known that inmates were repeatedly being out-of-bound	
23	on Plaintiff's unit under the existing staffing levels and procedures.	
24	Plaintiff's Third Motion to Compel	
25	Denied because Defendant admits that Plaintiff signed a "Notification of Central	

Inmate Monitoring (CIM) Classification or Declassification for on or about June 28, 2016.

Whether there is a CIM's assignment of separation from Powell is privileged, law

enforcement information, important to the security of the BOP facilities. It implicates a

26

27

28

nonparty inmate's rights under the Privacy Act. Most importantly, the existence of the CIMs, which is not disputed, does not go to prove Plaintiff's state of mind, i.e., that he was scared of Terell Powell. Plaintiff is free to argue this based on the undisputed fact that he signed the June 28, 2016 CIMs notification.

## Plaintiff's Motion for Sanctions

Denied for the same reason the Court denied the Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. (Order (Doc. ) at 2-13.)

## Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED** that the pending discovery motions (Docs. 54, 70, 75) are DENIED, except the Second Motion to Compel (Doc. 54) is GRANTED IN PART for Requests for Admissions 11, 12, and 13. Discovery is closed except for these answers.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendant's Motion for Consolidated Briefing (Doc. 83) and Motion to Extend Deadline for Defendant's Dispositive Motion (Doc. 86) are GRANTED, as follows:

- 1. Defendant's Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment (Docs. 76-81) is consolidated to include a Cross-motion for Summary Judgment to be filed April 26, 2019.
- 2. Plaintiff's Combined Reply supporting his Motion for Summary Judgment and Response to Defendant's Cross-motion for Summary Judgment shall be due by May 31, 2019.
  - 3. Defendant shall file a Reply within 14 days of Plaintiff's Reply/Response. Dated this 19th day of April, 2019.

